

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

The Applicant thanks Examiner Weiskopf for conducting a telephonic interview with Applicant's attorney, Jeffrey Valley.

During the interview, Applicant's attorney presented arguments traversing the 103(a) rejection based on Shirane (U.S. 5,491,631) and Borugian (U.S. 6,701,231) and the 103(a) rejection based on Shirane, Borugian and Wellman (U.S. 6,212,449). Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, and in the interest of expediting allowance of this application, Applicant's attorney proposed the following amendments:

Amending independent Claims 1, 12 and 43 to clarify that the plurality of systems comprises: a diagnostics system for providing one or more diagnostic codes; and *at least one of a vehicle video system, a vehicle security system, an obstacle detection system, a vehicle media system, a vehicle environment system, or a vehicle sound system...* (Emphasis added). Examiner Weiskopf stated that by removing "vehicle video system", the amended claims were patentable over the cited references, but would require an updated search.

Amending independent Claims 23 and 33 to clarify that *"the deciphered explanation contains a textual explanation of the vehicle diagnostic code and a graphical illustration of a component associated with the vehicle diagnostic code"*. (Emphasis added). Examiner Weiskopf agreed that the amended claims were patentable over the cited references, but would also require an updated search.

Applicant thanks Examiner Weiskopf for her time, and the amendments discussed during the interview have been incorporated in this response.